20c DECEMBER 4, 1950

New Republic

A DOSSIER ON THE FBI — 1908-1950

By ALAN BARTH

WHY ASIA FEARS THE WEST

By MICHAEL STRAIGHT

EXCESS PROFITS TAX— PROS AND CONS

By LOUIS WALINSKY

HAROLD L. ICKES ON:

A PARDON FOR DEWEY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic *in the* CLASSROOM

For thirty-six years the *New Republic* has been used as a supplementary text in colleges and universities all over the United States.

Professors of Economics, History, Sociology and English have long recognized its value as a means of bringing the immediate present into the classroom.

In the *New Republic* the students meet mature minds that are neither cynical nor indifferent. They are brought face to face with ideas and problems that will shape their lives and to which they will make their own contributions. They come in contact with good writing and good reporting. They learn about significant books and writers, take part in discussions and controversies, and are kept abreast of proposals and plans for meeting the challenge of the future for which they are being prepared.

If you are a teacher will you please consider the *New Republic* for your classes this Fall Semester?

SPECIAL CLASSROOM RATES

Each student's copy costs 10¢ weekly (half the regular price) if ten or more are mailed to a single address. Free desk copies are included for each instructor. Orders may be placed for any number of weeks, even for one week only, if desired, or for the entire semester. Copies are mailed from Washington, D. C., on Tuesdays, two days before the *New Republic* appears on any newsstand. Students are assured of receiving the magazine while the news and topics are fresh and exciting.

Advance payment is not necessary. You need only fill out the order form provided below and send it to us. The bill will be sent later.

ORDER FORM

NEW REPUBLIC, 40 East 49 Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of the *New Republic* for ..... weeks beginning with the issue which will reach us about .....
@ 10¢ a copy (regularly 20¢). Payment will be made on receipt of your bill.

Name.....College or University.....

City.....Zone.....State..... 12/4/50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR DEC. 4, 1950

5 Future of the Left, An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 Waiting for China
7 Schumacher's Show
7 Aluminum Cutback
8 Congress and the Census
8 Race Tag on Blood
9 Phone Strike Ends
9 Letter from India
10 Outside America
11 Excess Profits Tax—Pros and Cons, by Louis Walinksy
14 Why Asia Fears the West, by Michael Straight
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 A Dossier on the FBI—1908-1950, by Alan Barth
19 The Prospect Before Us, reviewed by V. O. Key Jr.
20 An Enigmatical Genius, by Christopher Sykes
20 The Trouble of One House, reviewed by Kate Simon
21 Music
22 Movies

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTER: Jean Begeman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1950, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

"WHATEVER I may think about General MacArthur," said one of Washington's top diplomats here last week, "I have never known him wrong militarily." This is one aspect of as bizarre a situation as this column can remember. Two nations which do not recognize each other, which do not exchange envoys, were fighting each other on the territory of a third with the first (USA) genuinely uncertain what the second (China) was fighting about. Nor was this all.

Chinese Communists moved down into Korea in mid-October, with fanfare and propaganda, to surprise advancing UN forces. After a fierce, bloody encounter, they appeared to fall back for a while; UN troops couldn't find them. There was every motive in the world for Russia to embroil America in full-scale war with China. But had she done it? It was like balancing on the edge of a precipice blindfolded. Nobody knew. From Truman down everybody assured China we had no territorial ambitions. With what effect? Nobody knew. But as the 7th Division advanced it enveloped two reservoirs (Changjin and Pujon) which fed power into the grid which supplies both Korea and Manchuria. Our troops did not cut the power lines. Current flowed from behind the battle area from one antagonist to another. It still flows. We had stated this would happen; now it was proved. Furthermore UN troops did not cross the Yalu; they came up and stopped. It was communication by sign language. Nevertheless, it was communication. Did this affect the Chinese decision? Again, nobody knows, but something did.

But at the start of last week in the alternating moods of Washington there was a sudden brief flare of hope. For a time at least it was thought Chinese resistance might be only token. This was disspelled by strong counter-attacks, and the whole issue of MacArthur's promises and judgment have hung in the balance. Yet almost certainly, somehow, somewhere, assurance had been given China that we would consider a borderline buffer zone.

With events developing so fast in a situation so fantastic it is impossible to say what happens next. But we feel confidence in outlining the following background. MacArthur planned his wind-up attack three weeks earlier but postponed it to get winter supplies and to protect his exposed right flank. Arrival of the Chinese UN mission in New York at the same time as resumption of the offensive was simple coincidence. Again MacArthur was so confident of the result that he signaled his play in advance (one vehicle was the United Press) and issued one of his characteristically bombastic communiques, besides the promise to troops they would be "home" by Christmas (which to MacArthur apparently means Japan, where he has lived so long it seems home). Finally, MacArthur was not acting in this move alone as some alarmed observers felt; his plans had Pentagon, State Department and White House approval and in this instance were approved by the British. They have confidence in MacArthur the General, gravest doubts about MacArthur the statesman.

Congress is back and Washington seems like itself again. We can settle ourselves now for a comfortable two-year period of White House-Congressional turmoil. It would be un-American to suggest that this is a bad sysem or that improvement could be made. For the moment the issue is deficit-inflation. The Baltimore *Sun's* able Mark Watson figures that four months' remobilization outlay is $12.4 billion on top of some $25 billion previously authorized. For this staggering obligation it is Truman's job to get more money and higher taxes. It is the main business of the Lame Duck session, due to sit only about three weeks.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There's a Washington theory that if Acheson shaved his moustache half his troubles with Congress would disappear. We feel he would have to go further than that. His gray-reddish upswept eyebrows would have to go, too. They match the moustache. Then the aristocratic nose that looks so hawklike in profile. But that wouldn't be enough, either; the tailored clothes, the protruding handkerchief and sleeve cuffs, the arched-out necktie: these are an affront to midwest Congressmen. Would that suffice? No, it goes deeper still. As we watched him bantering with reporters last week, lightly and humorously fending off questions whose only purpose was to disembowel him, we saw that internal changes would be needed to scale him down to Knowland-Wherry-Taft size. His independence of judgment must be modified, a ready agreement cultivated to charges that he is a crook, a thief and a Communist and hostility must even be built up to all our European allies. After that everything would be easy for him.

Notes: Who are the isolationists? Langer (R, ND) has voted 30 times out of 30 against the Administration on selected foreign issues in three years; Kem has approved only twice, Malone, Butler and Dworshak only three times, Jenner and Williams five, and Wherry, seven. On the other end of the scale, Vandenberg, Morse and Lodge approved every one. . . . Truman and Max Lowenthal, author of the new book critical of the FBI, used to be close friends. In this intimacy with Truman, Bert Andrews, head of the *Herald Tribune's* Washington bureau who reviewed the book, seemed to find sinister implications, a new test of guilt by association. . . . Few observers feel Truman appointees have raised the Supreme Court's calibre; deploring the over-conscientiousness of a colleague in preparing briefs other Government lawyers observed mournfully: "He acts just as though the Court knew the difference." . . . Taft's job in the next two years as Presidential aspirant is to show how liberal he is; he will propose a softer T-H law.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

"The Traitor"

SIR: Robert St. John's notes on Bill Shirer's *The Traitor* (the *NR*, November 11) are insufferably bad, and for all the wrong reasons. Strikes me that St. John, like Shirer, eagerly is rabbit-punching Marshall, Taft and a number of vulnerable set-ups in order to make the ringside judges and referees forget the fouls delivered—albeit with good, woozy, well-intentioned left hooks—by both writers in approximately the same period. I mean that both St. John and Shirer were early, abject left-wing towel-boys who never should have been permitted in the ring in the first place.

The Traitor is a damn bad novel, exciting in spots only because Shirer, despite himself, gets excited by the drama of the events at hand. Like *Berlin Diary*, this book represents, obviously, much rewrite, after the fact. . . .

New York City RAY BROCK

SIR: Mr. Brock and I have only one thing in common: we both were once reporters in Yugoslavia for American newspapers.

Mr. Shirer and I have many things in common, among them the fact that Nazi Propaganda Chief Goebbels placed *Berlin Diary* and *From the Land of Silent People* on his list of the 10 worst books of the forties. Apparently Mr. Brock agrees, which gives him something in common with Herr Goebbels. He says further that Shirer and I should never have been "permitted in the ring," and that too is akin to the Nazi policy of suppressing the voices of those with whom one does not agree.

New York City ROBERT ST. JOHN

Three Decades

SIR: In the course of his uneven critical review in the October 16 issue of the *New Republic* of *The Verdict of Three Decades*, edited by Julien Steinberg, A. J. P. Taylor says at one point:

> Steinberg, in his anti-Bolshevik zest, would even persuade us that there was no need for the October Bolshevik Revolution: Russia, it seems, was already a Socialist country. . . .

Now, while Mr. Steinberg may have attempted such persuasion "in his anti-Bolshevist zest," he could well have done so on the basis of closer acquaintance with the course of events in Russia at that time than Mr. Taylor has demonstrated in making this observation. For while it may have been *logical* in the context of the time and place, there *was* no *need* for the October Revolution, and Russia *was* a Socialist country.

The tragic history of Russia between the fateful months of February and October of 1917 has been well documented and it would be wasteful of time and space to develop it here; a few basic facts concerning it, however, might be brought to Mr. Taylor's apparently incredulous attention. . . .

The October Revolution was not necessary from any viewpoint save that of the Bolsheviks themselves; the essentials of the revolution had taken place in February, aided by no force as much as by the utter collapse of the old regime. Certainly the material benefit of the Russian people was not advanced. Even before February the standards of national society were rising with rapid and continuing acceleration. . . . This Bolshevik Revolution was not aimed at Czarism, which in October was dead beyond recall, but rather at the forces of the democratic moderate socialism of the Provisional Government. Without it, Russia might well have been spared the unbelievable horrors and miseries of the Civil War and the burden of a regime in many ways as reactionary as that of the Czars and vastly more durable. . . .

The Provisional Government was doomed practically from the start: doomed because it could not defend itself against the sort of internal attack the Bolsheviks were certain to mount sooner or later; and because it divorced itself from popular support by failing to recognize that the strongest and most insistent force in the Russia of 1917 was an overwhelming longing for peace. But this foreordained doom does not on any grounds predicate the "need" for the October Revolution to achieve a true revolution's objectives in Russia, as Mr. Taylor implies. . . .

New York City WENDELL S. RICHARDSON

SIR: Russia was a Socialist country between February and October, 1918, in the sense that Germany became a Socialist country in November, 1918. There were many social reforms on paper and a democratic constitution. But the later history of the Weimar Republic (or, for that matter, of republican Austria) is a warning against taking this temporary swing to the Left as synonymous with the establishment of Socialism.

London, England A. J. P. TAYLOR

Los Angeles Censorship

SIR: At a meeting of teachers tonight I discovered that at least two (Canoga Park and Hamilton) high schools, and presumably all other high schools in the city of Los Angeles, have received *orders* to remove from the library shelves all copies of *The Nation* and the *New Republic* magazines, and to *lock them up*. . . .

Reseda, Calif. A TEACHER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 123, NUMBER 23, ISSUE 1879, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 4, 1950

New Republic

FUTURE OF THE LEFT

ORGANIZED labor and liberals are still studying the 1950 elections for future political guidance. The CIO, the AFL, the ADA and independent unions have all been commendably stalwart in stating that they are in political action to stay and will redouble their efforts in 1952. But inside the ranks of all these groups there is uncertainty and concern as to what changes each should make to improve its own performance and what is the best relationship with the Democratic Party for them to seek.

The CIO national convention just concluded did not debate political policy. The official convention line was to stand pat for more of the same. The resolutions on political action pinned labor's hopes for a comeback in 1952 on "an even larger registration" than that of 1950, which would—automatically it is presumed—"enlarge the liberal forces" in Congress. The resolution proposed no changes in strategy or policy and simply called for more money and effort to organize along the same lines.

Any soul-searching on the political role of the CIO will have to wait for the Executive Board meeting. The difference in views which existed at Chicago was neither clear enough nor sharp enough to have split the convention. But an open discussion might have helped to draw factional lines that have been threatening to form for some time.

Since the Communist bloc was finally disposed of at the Cleveland convention last year observers have been predicting a new factional formation in the CIO, with Walter Reuther emerging as the leader of a vaguely British-Labor Party kind of left. Whether or not he covets that role, Reuther has tried hard to keep the lines from forming and so far has succeeded. His potential opponents were clearly not anxious for a fight in Chicago, except for an extreme anti-Reuther fringe led by Joe Fisher, head of the Utility Workers' Union, who is rabid against public-power projects like MVA and TVA and announced his intention of "smoking the socialists out." The November elections raised delicate issues for the Reuther group. A number of his followers privately took an extremely critical view of the outcome. They suggested that the CIO should carefully review it own program in the campaign and seriously re-examine its relations with the Democratic Party, whose policies they considered largely responsible for their setbacks. Not even the hotheads proposed that labor should start a third party of its own, but there was considerable sentiment in the convention for the CIO either to become more independent of the Democratic Party or to penetrate deeper into its policy-making machinery.

The Americans for Democratic Action are torn between those who would turn from a political action role to one of planning and long-range thinking along the lines of a Fabian Society. Among those who still see planning without organized action in politics as too narrow a role for liberals, there is disagreement on the practical role liberals should play in the major parties, on what degree of "independence" of the Democratic Party they should strive for.

We do not believe that the loss of 28 Democratic seats in the House and six in the Senate is cause for a major shift in the liberal position. As between the two major parties, only the Democratic stands for progressive principles. The idea of a third party remains as impractical and undesirable as we felt it to be in 1948. Liberals must continue to work primarily within the Democratic Party. But they must learn how to be as liberal within the Democratic Party as they are outside. The tendency too often has been to knuckle under in Party affairs to supposedly superior political brains of old-line Democratic leaders. This has been especially true in New York City where the task of working *with* an Irish Catholic-dominated Democratic organization without accepting its dictates, has admittedly posed a stupendous problem. It compels liberals to function as an organized bloc within the Party to work before the primaries to insist on candidates of real stature and integrity, to always campaign on issues, and to work continuously to overthrow corrupt machines.

The best safeguard to the liberal position in Party matters would be to make the Party convention the real seat of authority in the Party. The convention could make democratic party control possible. If sessions were held every two years instead of every four, the convention could be developed into a national platform-making

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization for off-year as well as Presidential elections. By beginning work now, liberals could influence the Democratic convention of 1952 toward this end.

The principal political need on the left is education. Many of labor's political leaders are privately worried over the fact that so many of the union men they induced to go to the polls this year cast their votes for candidates organized labor was officially opposing. There have been CIO-AFL confidential talks about the problem, but the political chiefs will have difficulty getting the funds and the authority to educate union members between elections. In the AFL, too many powerful union heads are conservative Republicans. In the CIO, too few international unions really believe in broad education of their membership on subjects beyond the "pork chop" matters of wages and hours and working conditions. As a result, the political education needed to produce intelligent political action by labor is likely to be limited and timid. By joint appeal, liberal members of Congress might influence labor to emphasize education more heavily than is now planned.

ADA needs to carry on a different kind of education. Its members generally understand issues and vote correctly, but they need training in practical organization, in how to get new members and in how to appeal to non-intellectuals.

The political leaders of both labor and liberals must be prepared to withstand the drive that is sure to develop within their ranks and from some of their trusted friends in the Administration and in the Democratic Party hierarchy to softpedal "controversial" issues such as health insurance, the Brannan plan, the public development of power and civil rights. These cautious ones think of the PAC and the ADA as liabilities since those organizations replaced the Communist and the Progressive Party as major targets of Republican and newspaper abuse in many of this year's campaigns.

For the Left to temper its views to the right wing of the Democratic Party would be the road to liberal catastrophe. In spite of New Deal and Fair Deal reforms we still do not have either a depression-proof or an equitable economic system. Our civil liberties have rarely been in greater danger, and our minorities still suffer great injustices. Rather than a counsel of caution, the liberal order of the day should be one of advance if the Democratic Party is to be prevented from moving toward the right.

If the Truman Administration allows a Southerner to become Senate Majority Leader and the organization of the next Democratic Convention goes badly with regard to platform and rules, third party talk will surely revive. The main tasks for all the Left in the immediate future, however, are clear: To maintain its own integrity, to educate itself to understand the issues and operate effectively, and to organize itself strongly enough to become the leading spirit of the Democratic Party.

This is one early analysis of the problems of political action this election raised for liberals. We invite the fullest comments from our readers in what must be a continuing discussion.

THE WEEK

WAITING FOR CHINA

LAKE SUCCESS (NR Correspondent)

Six major activities occupied the United Nations last week. Listed roughly in order of importance, they were:

Communist China. On the all-important question of the Korean War and allied problems, operations at Lake Success came nearly to a halt, pending the arrival of the nine-member Peiping delegation to discuss China's charges of American "aggression" on Formosa. There was no expectation that real progress could be made in solving Far Eastern problems through formal proceedings. It was hoped, however, that private conferences between the Chinese Communists and the UN delegations from countries which have recognized their Government might throw some light on whether or not China and Russia want the Korean situation to degenerate into world war.

South Africa. The Union of South Africa has now shouldered aside the United States as the scene of the world's worst relations between the white and other races. The special Political Committee of the UN Assembly has been discussing this matter, and in particular the South African plan to set up special zones for land ownership by whites, Negroes and Indians. The South Africans continue to insist that this is a domestic issue and were persuasive enough to make the UN Committee wind up by telling South Africa and India to continue to confer privately until next spring, even though there is no prospect of any real agreement.

Trygve Lie's Peace Plan. By an overwhelming vote of 51-5 the Assembly recommended that all UN bodies should study Trygve Lie's 20-year peace plan put forward some months ago. The Lie Plan would have the Security Council meet regularly and frequently to consider dangers to peace; would make another attempt at control of atomic weapons; would halt the armament race; and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would set up a special UN police force.

Political Refugees. The World Court has handed down a disturbing decision saying that no country can be permitted a unilateral decision on who is or is not a political refugee. If generally accepted it will curtail the "right of asylum" of a political figure who seeks sanctuary in a foreign embassy within the boundaries of his own country but should not affect the status of political refugees who escape across a border.

Point Fourism. The Assembly has adopted a significant study program on problems of effective aid to undeveloped areas of the world: National income, landlordism, irrigation for arid lands, obstacles to foreign investment and development of farm cooperatives. This is at least a start, and in the right place—the UN.

Eritrea. The compromise solution on the future of Eritrea that has been developed in the Special Political Committee of the Assembly is for Eritrea and Ethiopia to be joined in a federation, with the former given a substantial (but at present vague) degree of autonomy. Like all compromises, this one is wholly satisfactory to nobody; but it might provide a stopgap solution of the question for 10 or 20 years until the Eritreans are ready—as they certainly are not today—for complete self-government.

SCHUMACHER'S SHOW

The waning popularity of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and his aloof Bonn regime was made clear November 19 when his Christian Democratic Union was badly beaten in the elections for Hesse and Württemberg-Baden which centered primarily over the question of Germany's role in European rearmament. Never loth to take up a popular cause, Kurt Schumacher led the Social Democrats in exploiting discontent over the prospect of war, domestic hardships and a divided Fatherland, and thereby won a majority in industrial Hesse, while replacing the CDU as the largest party in the Württemberg-Baden parliament.

Unlike Pastor Niemöller, whose attacks on Adenauer's policies are credited with leading many Protestants out of the CDU in Hesse, Schumacher and the Social Democrats are not "neutralists" and are not against rearmament as such. They say that they are against rearmament without consultation of the German people and without sufficient Allied supporting forces and are repeating their demands for a national election, which they now would be likely to win.

These two states are sufficiently balanced politically to reflect widespread German annoyance at Adenauer's high-handed way of handling a complex emotionally-charged subject. Most Germans seem by now to have developed an understandable reluctance to serve on any firing-line. This was reflected in Socialist Carlo Schmid's statement that "We Germans would rather live in houses under the Bolsheviks than in holes as free men." Other party leaders, however, especially Ernst Reuter and Franz Neumann in Berlin, are militantly anti-Communist, and Schumacher is likely to be forced to change his tune if and when he leads the party to national power.

The full extent of the shift in Germany is not quite clear, and is not likely to be clarified by the December 4 balloting in Berlin, where the atmosphere and the issues are far different from the Western Zones. The Catholic-Protestant split, aggravated by Niemöller's agitation and the recent resignation of the Protestant Minister of Interior, Gustav Heinemann, may lead to further CDU losses. There has always been Protestant feeling against Catholic predominance in the federal Government; an intensification of it might relegate the CDU to the role of a traditionally Catholic Center party.

The international effects of the anti-Adenauer shift in Germany are likely to be considerable. If French reluctance against German rearmament is finally overcome, Britain and the US may be faced with a German Government unable to discuss it. The French, in turn, are likely to view a Schumacher victory with a jaundiced eye. Adenauer's leanings have always been much more to the West than have the Socialist leader's, who has continually harped on the lost territories in the East. But each in their own way, the French and German reactions illustrate traditional fears and problems which will have to be overcome if the bolder European programs are to succeed.

ALUMINUM CUTBACK

The National Production Authority, which now controls the distribution of most scarce materials, has ordered a 35-percent reduction in the use of aluminum for civilian production — the first of many similar cutbacks affecting strategic metals likely to be ordered soon. Following this announcement Dewey Anderson, director of Public Affairs Institute, warned that federal officials responsible for adequate aluminum for mobilization must do more than cut back civilian use. "They must greatly expand production by backing new producers or we will be caught woefully short of this vital metal," he said in a letter to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and NPA Administrator William H. Harrison. "Bigger capacity is the real answer, and it must be built under a sound plan," he said.

Anderson has studied this problem in the past, first as executive officer of the TNEC and later as secretary of the Senate Small Business Committee which conducted an extensive investigation of light metals. He points out that World War II brought two new giant producers of aluminum, the Reynolds Metals Company and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Company, into existence without increasing the overall amount of aluminum available and without reducing the price of metal previously maintained by Alcoa (Aluminum Company of America). "These two newcomers have traveled regularly, happily and profitably under Alcoa's price umbrella," Anderson said. "They have done nothing to increase aluminum use through lowered prices. They have been in competition really with the 17,000 independent fabricators . . . [and] consider themselves free to cut off or limit the supplies of these independents to favor their own fabricating plants. They have even done this with supplies they have withdrawn from the 375-million pound Government defense stockpile now wholly depleted."

To provide the needed supply of new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aluminum and to help rather than injure competition, Anderson recommended a five-point program that would include the following elements:

Bring in several new producers in addition to the Big Three.

In each contract for Government funds require that new producers turn over all or a major part of their production to independent fabricators or to the Government stockpile.

Make these new producers really independent of Alcoa by helping them obtain a bauxite supply and establish a Bayer plant that would be jointly owned and operated by all of them.

Obtain a large proportion of emergency aluminum requirements from Canadian sources at or below current prices and under conditions safeguarding our domestic industry.

Give the independent fabricators an early opportunity to get defense orders.

"If these new producers really compete in prices, as Kaiser and Reynolds were expected to do," Anderson said, "the savings to the economy would not be inconsiderable. On a national consumption of two billion pounds in 1955, a three cent per pound reduction would represent the interest on $2 billion worth of Government debt."

HERBLOCK IN THE WASHINGTON POST

"I'm doing my best to get you in, pal"

CONGRESS AND THE CENSUS

When the 82nd Congress convenes in January, President Truman will report the number of members of the House of Representatives to which each state is entitled. The 1950 Census, which recorded a 14.5 percent rise in the population since the 1940 census, will result in a reshuffling of House seats and is sure to cause a political spat. Because of the shift in population, seven states will gain and nine will lose seats in the 435-member House to be elected in two years. And, of course, if statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is passed during the interim session, the total number of House seats will either be increased, or again reapportioned.

The size of the House is left up to Congress. The Constitution simply provides that whatever the total number of seats, they must be apportioned among the states according to population. In 1790, there were 105 members of the House. As new states were admitted to the Union and as the population increased, Congress added new seats rather than reapportioning the 105. However, when the size of the House reached 435, after the 1910 census was taken, Congress called a halt to any further increase and agreed to redistribute those seats among the states after each 10-year population count.

Under the Congressional Apportionment Act, Congress has 15 days after it receives the latest official census totals to enlarge the House membership by the necessary 14 seats or to reapportion on the basis of the present 435 members. California, which accounted for about one-fifth of the population growth of the entire United States, will gain seven House seats. It advanced from the fifth most populous state in 1940 to a position second only to New York in 1950. Florida will gain two seats, and Maryland, Michigan, Texas, Virginia and Washington, one seat each.

If Congress does not enlarge House membership, New York will lose two seats but will still have the largest delegation with 43 members. Pennsylvania, which will lose three seats, will rank with California as second largest delegation with 30 Representatives. Missouri and Oklahoma stand to lose two seats apiece. Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee each lose one.

The real battle will begin in the states losing House seats if Congress decides to redistrict rather than enlarge the House. Governors and state legislatures will be notified to make the necessary changes in state districts in time for the 1952 elections. In states like New York and Pennsylvania, where Republican and Democratic factions often control certain districts, political parties will attempt to seek advantage for themselves in mapping out the new districts. If a state losing seats has not done its redistricting by the next Congressional election, all its Congressmen must be elected "at large" and that could spell disaster for the political party in the minority during the Presidential election year.

RACE TAG ON BLOOD

For decades it has been an established scientific fact, known to every freshman student in biology, that human blood is all alike, from whatever race it comes. There are classifications for blood, according to "type" or the presence or absence of the RH factor, but the color of one's skin has nothing to do with such classifications. In the past the Red Cross, more for political than medical reasons, dutifully tagged blood according to race—white, Negro, Oriental or any other. Last week, however, the national board of governors, meeting in Chicago, finally moved to eliminate the racial designation of donors in the Red Cross blood collecting program.

For years a blood donor's race has been noted on his medical history card. Negro organizations have charged that it is a form of racial discrimination. The question even arose before a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government loyalty board during the hearing of Dorothy Bailey, whose case is now pending before the Supreme Court. Judge Henry Edgerton of the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in his dissent, cited the following colloquy between a member of the Regional Loyalty Board and Miss Bailey to show that some loyalty boards are not aware that unconventional views do not always indicate disloyalty: "*Mr. Blair:* Did you ever write a letter to the Red Cross about the segregation of blood? *Miss Bailey:* I do not recall. *Mr. Blair:* What was your personal position about that? *Miss Bailey:* Well, the medical . . . *Mr. Blair:* I am asking yours. *Miss Bailey:* I have no personal opinion."

It is gratifying that the Red Cross has finally moved to help clear up the blood myth.

PHONE STRIKE ENDS

The 11-day-old telephone strike ended last week with satisfactory gains for the 33,000 telephone equipment workers involved. Seventeen thousand CIO Western Electric workers obtained average wage increases of 11.3 cents an hour. The union had asked for 15 cents an hour over the former basic scale of $1.55 and $1.62. In Detroit 16,000 other members of the Communications Workers of America settled their separate controversy with the Michigan Bell Telephone Company, with the company agreeing to a $5-a-week raise for workers earning $78 or more, $4 for those who earn $50-$77 and $3 for those making $49 or less.

Major victory for the unions was an agreement to shorten the duration of the new contract. Both Western Electric and Michigan Bell had at first insisted on a two-year contract allowing wage reopening only after 18 months. The final agreement reduced this provision to 15 months. In addition, the contract provides wage progression payments as employees accumulate service and periodic merit wages for workers with long employment records. The union announced that the contract is the biggest and best negotiated this year in the Bell system.

THE RELUCTANT BANKERS

The Federal Reserve Board has issued a stiff "last warning" to the banks to curb the present record volume of inflationary credit or take the consequences in the form of tighter Government controls. Mixing mild words with implied threats, FRB Chairman Thomas B. McCabe wrote the System's 7,000 banks that "the sacrifice of some bank earnings at this time is a small price to pay" for curbing inflation. So far Government authorities have relied on bankers' self-discipline, but the figures show that their resistance to the lure of quick profits has not been very high.

Apologists for the banks point out that while the volume of commercial credit has risen very sharply, the total amount of outstanding obligations has risen only $1.5 billion. This means that the banks have been heavily unloading their holdings of Government securities for inflation-feeding business loans. Stressing that the "persistent and unprecedented rise in bank loans has been the major factor in the country's increasing money supply," McCabe has again called on the banks to cease undercutting the Government's attempts to stabilize the dollar.

LETTER FROM INDIA

NEW DELHI

On the crisp afternoon of November 11, India spread the regal red carpet at Palam Airport in New Delhi to receive His Nepalese Majesty. The King that stepped down was in commoner's clothes, a fugitive breathing free air for the first time in 45 years. On November 5, the Indian Ambassador in Kathmandu, Nepalese capital, had put in a telephone call to Prime Minister Nehru in Delhi. The next day the "Incarnation of Vishnu," accompanied by his family and a number of tiffin boxes filled with jewels, left his palace "prison," ostensibly for a picnic. As their route passed the Indian Embassy, the party in a split second was inside the gates. For the first time in history, a foreign embassy gave asylum to a king on his own soil.

The ruling Ranas of Nepal had miscalculated. The repeated visits to Kathmandu by the American ambassador and the British High Commissioner from Delhi had left Maharaja Mohan Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana, the hereditary Prime Minister, with the belief that Nepal could go over India's head. But when the test came, the Rana found both those countries following India's lead. A stern note was dispatched from Delhi, demanding the safe passage of the King, or else. . . ! The King's departure for India was a signal for public mourning in Kathmandu, and popular revolt on the Indo-Nepalese border.

Still under the impact of events in Tibet, Delhi oscillated between a sense of danger and a sense of opportunity in the period of turmoil that followed. The troops of Red China are still 450 miles northeast of Simla across the snow-capped mountains. And now that the "roof of the world" has blown away, there is great anxiety to save the ceiling.

The interplay of six forces will decide the outcome:

First, the ruling Ranas. About a century ago, this clan, descendants of an Indian Rajput family, effected a successful coup. They turned the King into only a spiritual head, made him a palace prisoner and began a system of hereditary prime ministership by which the office passes to the younger brother from the elder one. The Ranas have provided most of the generals in Nepal—as numerous as Kentucky Colonels in America. By protecting and glorifying their own blood-purity, they have kept power away from the "native" Gurkhas.

The ruling Ranas have been traditional friends of India, marrying among the Rajput families of this country. At present, they are estranged because their fugitive King has been given asylum and India has refused to recognize the "boy king" they have put on the throne in his place. But the Ranas are bound to be even less friendly to an eventually Red Tibet and an already Red China, so a compromise with India is not out of the question.

Second, the Dissident Ranas. Victims of periodic coups, palace revolutions and family feuds, these and their descendants live in India, where they have property worth one billion rupees. These "half-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

castes" are the financial mainstay of the current revolt.

Third, His Majesty the King. A descendant of another Indian Rajput clan surnamed "Shah," he is grateful for India's support, and prefers to be a "Constitutional head" to an "imprisoned head."

Fourth, the Nepali Congress. A composite body of Nepali democrats, disillusioned Gurkha soldiers, neo-Communist agitators, dissident Ranas and Indian sympathisers, this group operates from a base in India along the lines once followed by the Indian National Congress. They hope that India will back them to the full. The Delhi authorities dashed those hopes somewhat by confiscating 3,500,000 rupees their President was bringing to the fugitive King.

Fifth, the Gurkha troops. The loyalty of these renowned fighters with their famed Kukris holds the balance. Their oath of allegiance is to the King, but their bread and butter come from the ruling Ranas. The Gurkha troops form not too negligible a part of the Indian Army and of the British Army in Asia. However, the 100 percent Hindu Nepal has flatly refused Pakistan any troops.

Sixth, the Indian attitude. Even though still neutral between the Eastern and the Western blocs, India is apprehensive about Communist infiltration in and around the sub-continent. Only a stable regime in Nepal can give liberal-democratic India a stable buffer. The strong autocracy of the Ranas would make the people amenable to Communist appeals. On the other hand, it would take time for a Gurkha democracy to put down firm roots in that rocky soil—and this is the moment in Kathmandu!

Both sides have appealed to India, and possible compromises are in the Delhi air. Some of the alternatives are: an invitation to the Indian Army to stabilize the situation; the return of the King with enhanced powers, with India helping to frame a more democratic constitution and supervising its implementation; "accession" to India in regard to the neighboring kingdoms of Bhutan and Sikkim, and a sharing of defense, communications and foreign policy.

Outside reactions to events in Nepal have underlined the trend toward greater cooperation between India, America and Britain that started with Korea. The "faithlessness" of Red China with respect to Tibet rankles in Delhi's bosom, and India is fast losing its color-blindness, fostered by centuries of friendship, and is beginning to see red for the yellow. For the first time in 2,000 years, India is facing the prospect of China as a rival, and as a result Delhi is on the eve of a re-orientation of its "external affairs."

K. L. SHRIDHARANI

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Europe lost the American elections. And for the European Left it was more than merely a defeat—the results of the voting, especially in terms of the make-up of the Senate, contain the makings of disaster.

"Setback for Europe," the title of Charles Ronsac's editorial in the Paris *Franc-Tireur,* one of the best anti-Communist Left dailies on the continent, gives the keynote of editorial comment both in France and Britain, and in Right and Center as well as Left publications. He wrote:

> Let's not hesitate to face the fact: Europe's freedom of opinion and social democracy have suffered a crushing defeat. For with Robert Taft, champion of isolationism and anti-laborism, the two real winners—*though they were not candidates*—were McCarthy and MacArthur. It would be difficult and premature to predict the repercussions of the disasters (which may result from the election in domestic policy) on American policy in the world, that is on the future of peace. But the elections provide a lesson equally valid for the democratic parties of Europe. . . . Truman might not have avoided political defeat if he had disavowed the "Caesar of the Pacific" by acts, if he had fought politically for Europe, if he had exposed the hysterics and witch-hunters to public contempt, and if he had proudly waved the Fair Deal banner; but he would surely have won morally a contest which he must now try to re-win. . . .

The Paris *Combat* wrote:

> Europe risks losing its last freedoms. Now Europe will get arms and munitions only if it submits entirely to the will of the American strategists and their moneylenders. Atlantic policy, as conceived and corrected by Taft, will be the policy of the Pentagon and United States heavy industry with all the organism of control over Europe that this implies—or there will be no policy. . . . We regret that Socialism and planning were so badly defeated and that the Fair Deal was condemned. But we fear, above all, that Europe may now really become a field of maneuver and a bastion for the American Government.

The London *Daily Herald,* which speaks for the British Labour Government, wrote quoting an unnamed American Labor leader as saying:

> Politically, American Labor is just where you were in Britain in 1905. We have still a long way to go. With big business taking over, we haven't much time to organize politically.

The London *Times* writes:

> The position of Secretary Acheson and of the State Department will be made infinitely more difficult and will become to an even greater extent than before the captive of his critics. . . . We can probably look forward to a very nasty Presidential campaign two years from now.

The Daily *Express* comments:

> The United States swings to the Right. It seems likely that a veto over policy, domestic and foreign, has passed into the hands of the Right-wing Democrats who often think and sometimes vote Republican. . . . There will certainly be a sterner insistence that European nations should show more convincing proof of self-help in self-defense. The balance of American interest may swing further over from Europe to the Far East.

In general, the British Conservative newspapers were torn between worry over the effect on Europe-firstism in the United States and satisfaction over the strengthening (they believe) of their chances in the coming effort to expel the Labour Government from office. Lord Beaverbrook's *Express* said:

> The change in American opinion gives this country a new opportunity for a wise decision. Britain should never have accepted Marshall aid. She has now a chance, not to be missed, to end that generous subvention.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXCESS PROFITS TAX — PROS AND CONS

by Louis Walinsky

ONLY A FEW short weeks ago, an excess profits tax seemed almost certain of passage when Congress reconvened after its election recess. Today, the prospects for enactment of an excess profits tax, whether in this Congress or the new one, seem doubtful indeed. This change in outlook is due to more than the election results. It is due in large part to the extremely effective criticism which has been advanced, not only by conservative businessmen, but also by business moderates like the Committee for Economic Development, and outstanding economists like Sumner Slichter and Arthur Davies. The caliber of this opposition and the apparent logic and cogency of their arguments certainly warrant a reconsideration of the entire question.

Let us start out by recognizing that most businessmen do not dispute the necessity for higher taxes on corporate profits. No responsible business spokesman has taken such an untenable position. There is general recognition that the Government's prospective deficit in fiscal 1952 (beginning July 1, 1951) will be in the range of $10-15 billion, depending chiefly on the rate of acceleration of military expenditures. Further, there is general agreement that since we face continued high level military outlays for years ahead, we must come as close as we possibly can to paying for them out of taxes as we go, if inflation and an unmanageable public debt are to be avoided. Enlightened businessmen recognize that a large part of the added tax burden will have to be borne by corporate enterprise, by virtue both of equity and ability to pay.

The issue, therefore, is not one of choice between an excess profits tax on corporations on the one hand and higher taxes on other segments of the economy (higher individual income taxes, manufacturers' excise taxes, retail sales taxes) on the other. It is rather a question of how much more revenue should be raised by new taxes on corporate profits and what form these higher taxes on corporations should take. No matter what decision is made with respect to corporate profits, we shall have to impose new or larger taxes in other fields before very long.

How much more revenue should be derived from additional taxes on corporate profits? It would be less difficult to answer this question if we knew more about the course of defense expenditures in the next 12 to 18 months.

One needs only to examine the figures *(See Table on page 12.)* to see that corporate enterprise is capable of contributing substantially to the rapidly mounting costs of defense without serious hardship. The postwar period has been one of unparalleled prosperity for America's corporations. By whatever criterion one chooses—profits before taxes, profits after taxes, dividends paid to stockholders, profits retained in the business or profits after taxes as a percentage of net worth—the figures are truly amazing. Profits at the present time fully justify the adjectives which have been used in recent weeks by business journals—"astronomical" and "out-of-this-world."

One can best judge the overall effect which various proposals for increasing tax revenues from corporate profits would have by projecting the 1951 situation. It is estimated that in 1951 corporations will earn some $45 billion before taxes—a new record. At present tax rates—45 percent—some $20 billion would be taken in taxes, and profits after taxes would be approximately $25 billion. The Committee for Economic Development's proposal to take an additional $3 billion in taxes would leave corporations with some $22 billion after taxes—about $1 billion in excess of the previous historical high attained in 1948. The Administration's proposal to take an additional $4 billion would leave them with some $21 billion—just about equal to the previous historical high. The AFL's proposal to take some $5 to $6 billion would leave corporations with $19 to $20 billion, and the CIO's proposal to take some $6 to $7 billion would leave them with $18 to $19 billion—levels which may still be regarded as handsome in relation to previous experience and returns on investment.

In *aggregate* terms, American corporations could certainly pay an additional $6 to $7 billion without experiencing any real hardship. *Within* that aggregate, however, a great many corporations could suffer very real hardships indeed, depending on the kind and degree of the taxes imposed. It is precisely this question which is basically at issue in the current debate about the excess profits tax, as we see if we let the supporters and the opponents of the excess profits tax state the pros and cons in their own terms.

The Equity Argument

Pro: Under an excess profits tax, by far the largest share of additional taxes paid will come from the rela

Louis Walinsky is director of the Labor Division of Robert R. Nathan Associates in Washington. A graduate of Cornell University, he has been economic consultant to the War Production Board and director of the Office of Economic Review and Analysis of the Civilian Production Administration.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tively small number of corporations whose earnings have increased as a result of the defense effort. Most corporations will not be required to pay more taxes than they are paying now. By taxing away that part of corporate profits which is in excess of "normal," we shall be taxing in accordance with ability to pay, and we shall eliminate profiteering on the national emergency.

Con: No formula or base period can be devised which will affect all corporations equitably. An excess profits tax will be particularly inequitable in its effect on new corporations which lack a base period of previous earnings; on companies which had depressed earnings during the assigned base period; on young and growing companies whose earnings were bound to expand in the absence of defense expenditures. Moreover, no one formula can apply equitably to corporations in different industries, different companies within the same industry, large and small companies. Finally, excess profits can best be recaptured by renegotiation of defense contracts, rather than by an excess profits tax.

Rebuttal: No tax can do more than rough justice. Most of the difficulties cited can be mitigated in whole or in large part by appropriate provisions in the law. So far as renegotiation is concerned, that process cannot recapture excess profits earned indirectly from the defense effort.

The Inflation Argument

Pro: An excess profits tax would be anti-inflationary, because when corporations know that they will be able to retain only a small part of the additional profits they might get by raising prices, the incentive to raise prices is considerably dampened.

Con: An excess profits tax is inflationary, because when virtually confiscatory taxes are imposed on profits in excess of a given amount, corporations are encouraged to spend money wastefully and extravagantly on such items as advertising, entertaining, travel, etc. They also lose interest in improving production techniques and reducing costs. Their resistance to higher wages is also weakened. All these effects are highly inflationary.

Rebuttal: The "confiscatory" nature of the excess profits tax is reduced by lowering the effective rate to a reasonable level like 75 percent. The extravagence argument has been considerably overdone. Corporations know they inevitably face the day when the emergency will be gone, and they will have to meet tough competition again. They simply cannot afford to fall into sloppy production techniques and permit costs to inflate. Corporations never raise wages unless they have to. Provision should be written into the law disallowing abnormally high outlays for certain categories of costs which lend themselves to such corporate abuse.

The Investment Argument

Pro: Corporations will have less money and less incentive to invest in plant and equipment for the production of luxury and non-essential goods, thus conserving scarce materials, manpower and facilities for the defense effort.

SELECTED DATA ON CORPORATE PROFITS

	Profits Before Taxes	*Taxes*	*Profits After Taxes*	*Dividends Paid*	*Undivided Profits*	*Profits After Tax as Percent of Net Worth*[3]
	— billions of dollars —					%
1939	6.5	1.5	5.0	3.8	1.2	6.8
1941	17.2	7.8	9.4	4.5	4.9	8.4
1943	25.0	14.4	10.6	4.5	6.1	9.1
1944	24.3	13.5	10.8	4.7	6.1	8.4
1946	23.5	9.6	13.9	5.8	8.1	12.1
1947	30.5	11.9	18.5	6.6	11.9	13.0
1948	33.9	13.0	20.9	7.5	13.4	16.1
1949	27.6	10.6	17.0	7.8	9.2	11.7
1950[1]	*37.0*	*15.0*	*22.0*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*	*n.a.*
1st Q[2]	29.2	12.0	17.2	8.1	9.1	12.0
2nd Q[2]	37.4	15.1	22.2	8.1	14.1	15.6
3rd Q[2]	42.0	17.6	24.4	9.1	15.3	n.a.
1951[1]	45.0	?	?	?	?	?

[1] Estimated.
[2] Annual Rate. Third Quarter Estimated.
[3] For manufacturing corporations only. Figures through 1947 from "Statistics of Income," after 1947 from S.E.C.-F.T.C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Con: The tax would destroy the incentive and the ability of corporations to invest in plant and equipment for the expansion of production in precisely those industries where such incentive and ability are most needed. Profits tend to be highest where goods are in short supply, and prices rise in response to shortages. It is these very industries which would be hit hardest by an excess profits tax. While the profit motive cannot be permitted to guide expansion of industry in wartime, what we face is perhaps a very long period of partial mobilization, and normal economic incentives will work best in such a period.

Rebuttal: Adequate incentive to expand plant and equipment where necessary will be provided through accelerated amortization, as was done during the last war. Expansion loans can be extended by the Government, if necessary. The excess profits tax did not stifle the incentive or the ability of industry to expand during the last war and will not do so now.

The Administration Difficulty Argument

Pro: In order to raise large sums of money, you've got to go where the money is. The corporations, particularly those whose earnings have risen tremendously since Korea, have got it.

Con: An excess profits tax would be almost impossible to administer. Thousands of corporations will appeal for relief on the grounds of inequity or hardship. No administrative set-up can be devised that can settle these cases both equitably and promptly. Even today, five years after the termination of the last excess profits law, there are still 2,700 cases pending involving a far larger number of claims.

The Political Argument

Pro: Workers, consumers, "little" people generally, have identified the excess profits tax with the elimination of profiteering and a just sharing of the rearmament burden. Their morale will be adversely affected if such a tax is not enacted.

Con: The excess profits tax is just another "soak-the-rich" proposition which panders to popular ignorance and prejudice and is politically motivated.

The Alternative Tax Argument

Pro: In preference to an excess profits tax, we should impose a higher tax rate on *all* corporations. A defense supertax should be added to the current normal and surtax rate of 45 percent, bringing the total rate paid by all corporations to 50 or more percent. A rate of 57 percent, it is estimated, would raise an additional $4 billion, which is the amount the Administration proposes to raise by an excess profits rate of 75 percent on earnings in excess of 75 percent of those averaged in any three years of the 1946-49 period.

Con: A higher flat rate on all corporations would be decidedly unfair to the great majority of corporations which will not enjoy increased profits, or even as large profits during the defense period as they did before the emergency. Whereas an excess profits tax might work an inequity on a relatively small number of corporations which could apply for and obtain relief, a higher flat rate would impose inequities on most corporations which could not be ameliorated.

How are these arguments to be evaluated? To what conclusions do they lead? Obviously, the case is not a clear-cut or one-sided one. It is an issue which must be decided on balance, on the side that has the most weight. On balance, the argument favors the excess profits tax. Much of the criticism advanced today is pertinent to the excess profits tax of World War II. We need not, however, think of the tax in those terms exclusively. The experience gained—indeed, the very criticisms which are now offered in opposition to an excess profits tax—make it possible to write a much better law than we wrote last time.

The recommendations submitted by the Treasury have already made considerable progress in this direction. The recent hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee should result in even more.

The Treasury recommendations for a base period of 75 percent of the average earnings of any three years during the 1946-49 period, with an alternative base of about 10, 8 and 6 percent on invested capital (depending on the size of the corporation), should make the tax tolerable for most corporations. Further, the Treasury's recommendations with respect to minimum credits and allowances for borrowed capital, new capital and "growth" corporations should go a long way toward minimizing or eliminating the inequities which might otherwise be involved for many corporations. We might go beyond the Treasury's recommendations and consider whether new corporations, or new enterprises of established corporations, should not be exempted from the excess profits rate on their earnings. We might consider, too, whether additional credits against the excess profits tax rate should not be granted in certain industries on behalf of profits reinvested in plant and equipment (in such an event, of course, presently-planned accelerated amortization would have to be reconsidered too).

The current debate should be evaluated, not in terms of the excess profits tax we had during the last war, but in terms rather of an *improved* excess profits tax we are undoubtedly able to formulate now. Considered in these terms, a good deal of the cogency of the opposition's argument vanishes, and the case for an excess profits tax becomes relatively clear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY ASIA FEARS THE WEST

by Michael Straight

THE REVOLUTION that is tormenting Asia was aimed at economic misery and foreign rule. Today these two aspects of the revolution are in conflict with each other. Formerly, economic misery was blamed on the imperialist power; national independence would end it once and for all. Now, increasing misery is the responsibility of the new governments of Asia. They must turn to the imperialists for aid.

The need for aid starts with technical assistance to maintain the services established in colonial days, and to do all that the colonial powers failed to do. Health is only one problem. The health needs of the Asian village are analyzed in a recent survey by a private agency, the Pennsalt Health and Agriculture Service.

"Various doctors advised that the death rate for children was very high due in large part to malaria, infant diarrhea, typhoid and many other infections. Some of these infections are spread by the common housefly. In many villages visited it was noted that most of the children who were too small to fan off the flies had flies gathered on their faces and bodies, especially on areas where open sores appeared. One particularly significant aspect was the presence of flies crawling on nursing mothers and their infants during feeding.

"Flies were found to breed in the manure piles in the stables, in the human feces scattered throughout the villages and in the pads of manure which were being dried to be used as fuel."

This survey happens to describe conditions in Iran. But the same words would describe any one of four million villages throughout Asia and in all the underdeveloped areas where technical assistance is urgently needed today.

Asia's second need is for short-range economic aid, to start rehabilitation in war-torn areas, and to combat inflation. The most dangerous aspect of inflation is rising food prices. The immediate cause of rising food prices is speculation and hoarding. A million tons of rice and grain, held in warehouses throughout the region, and released by governments whenever speculation develops, would lower food prices and help to bring inflation under control.

Asia's third need is for capital. She needs equipment to raise industrial production. She needs raw materials for use in plants now idle, or restricted to one shift, because of shortages caused by lack of foreign exchange. She needs consumers' goods to permit a diversion of domestic manpower to the expansion of industrial capacity without further reducing living standards. The need is urgent. "The economic situation in Southeast Asia," according to an Indian economist, N. V. Sovani, "has become so acute that without a bold and drastic attack on the situation there is almost a certainty that the whole area will go the way of China."

This bold attack must be led by the peoples of Asia. But it may never develop without the stimulus of foreign aid. Diplomats, civil servants, industrialists and labor leaders in Asia all insist, in public or in private, that foreign aid is necessary. Our Government agrees. The Gray Report estimates that Western rearmament will substantially aid the economies of Indonesia, Malaya, Thailand and Ceylon. But it adds that India cannot survive without aid. Gray concludes that about $1.3 billion in loans and grants is needed each year for the underdeveloped areas. India alone needs $200 million a year for five years to maintain minimum safe standards of living.

Private enterprise is not going to invest one-tenth of these sums overseas when the average rate of profit is 15 percent at home. And it is not welcome. Asians are suspicious of private investment, fearing that it will strengthen the political power of their own irresponsible capitalists, and wanting to strengthen their own struggling governments instead. The solution they seek, as Sovani states, is "the reorientation of the Point Four program along the lines of the Marshall Plan."

Yet foreign aid means foreign interference. Technical assistance at once raises explosive religious, social and political issues. Short-range aid involves the West in domestic programs to combat inflation. Above all a Marshall Plan means a clear diminution of sovereignty. Courageous men in Asia understand this. Sovani adds, "In some respects the Plan will have to go much further than the Marshall Plan. . . . It will be imperative for the US to give the capital equipment and the technical personnel, to provide the consumers' goods to ease the strain of absorption, to plan the program more directly than in Europe and to take a more active part in the actual execution of plans. . . ."

In addition economic aid can succeed only if it is preceded by political and military settlements and by social reforms. The US, for example, is certainly not going to give up needed supplies to finance either a trade

This is the fourth in a series. The final article will be published next week.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war or a military conflict between India and Pakistan.

Sovani concedes that in South Asia a wild armaments race, and a drive to develop competitive light industries is forcing economic nationalism and a diversion of needed resources. He concludes that: "The US will have to combat these tendencies by a guarantee against mutual and outside aggression. . . . A regional pact regarding the treatment of minorities will also help to ease growing tensions in these plural societies."

For these reasons, revolt against misery in Asia ends in reliance on foreign governments for aid. There it clashes with the revolt against foreign rule. For this revolt is still boiling in Asia.

It may not express itself in open resentment of the former colonial powers. In fact in India, Pakistan and Ceylon there is a kind of patronizing sympathy for Great Britain as America's newest colonial possession. There is no widespread hatred of Americans comparable to the feelings stirred up by Communists in industrial France and Northern Italy. But there are tensions that place limits on the help that Asians are willing to accept, even if aid is available.

These tensions cannot be overcome until they are understood. And mutual understanding, is hard to achieve. Subject peoples are trained to conceal their true feelings. And we are not famous for patience and discernment. An American accused of every crass and wicked motive tends to be so hurt and outraged by these charges that he fails to search for the true feelings that they serve to conceal.

I was helped, in Delhi, when after weeks spent with high-minded intellectuals I was visited by two reporters from a small Hindustani paper. I complained to them about Nehru's sanctimonious attitude on Korea. They quickly interrupted me.

"You must never pay too much attention to *what* our leaders say," they insisted. "You must ask *why* they say it."

"Our leaders may express their own convictions," they added. "But their words are significant only because they correspond to our unspoken desires. On Korea our leaders elevate to terms of morality and principle our sympathy for the North Koreans, our fear of becoming involved on your side, our belief that if Indian soldiers are to fight they should fight Pakistan." They asked: "Is not your country the same at heart?"

For these reasons, an attempt to catalogue the underlying tensions between Asia and the West is a dangerous but worthwhile task. They seem to derive in part from the following fears, antipathies, misunderstandings and conflicts of interest.

The fear of loss of prestige. British Socialists after lifetimes spent in damning capitalism choke in defending capitalist America. Liberals in the US hate to admit that they flirted with Communism too long. In the same way the inertia of the national revolution in Asia is still strong. Men who rose to power by arousing ardent nationalism find it humiliating to admit that independence solves few problems, and to plead for aid from nations they thrust aside.

The fear of loss of sovereignty. National sovereignty, for most of Asia, is five years old or less. Naturally it is guarded with passion against all encroachments. No colonial power can regain politically the power that Asia has won by political action. But Asians fear that economic control may transfer to America the dominating role that the colonial powers lost.

Political leaders, in search of issues, work naturally on these fears, although at the same time they welcome pressures *if* they are applied on the right side. An example at Lucknow was the outspoken and engaging secretary of the Indian Socialist Party. By night he warned mass meetings to guard against the twin evils of Soviet and US imperialism. By day he insisted that US aid should be given to India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon but only on condition that they form a South Asian federation with free trade and a single armed force.

The fear of foreign involvement. The conflicts within Asia are more bitter than those between Asia and the USSR. The domestic problems of Asian governments are overwhelming. They are hard pressed in peace time. They know that like Nationalist China they will be destroyed by involvement in a Third World War. They can contribute little in wartime. They intend to keep out of the world war they see approaching. They believe, with good reason, that the West sees them as pawns rather than peoples, and is concerned not with their welfare but with their contribution to the welfare of the West. The Western nations may protest that the struggle against Communism is world-wide. The nations of Asia are unmoved. They are not anti-Communist. They are not finally committed, for democracy or against the police state. And lacking modern armies and stable economies they are certainly not going to provoke the USSR. They have not experienced direct pressures from the USSR. They have been subjected to direct pressures from the West. Those are the pressures they recognize and resist. Beyond these fears there are several sources of antipathy.

Psychological antipathy. The basis of nationalism is pride. In newly-formed nations pride is inflamed. Nothing wounds national pride more than to depend on the charity of another nation. For that reason anti-American feeling was strong in Britain in 1946. For

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same reason Asians resent having to lean on the US today. They prefer to believe that we are selfish and ruthless rather than to admit that they depend on our generosity and goodwill.

Economic antipathy. All those who thrive on superstition and misery in Asia fear the intrusion of a nation committed to science and modern technology. And with some reason. When the gears of a high speed industrial machine are meshed with those of a slowly turning economy the results are bound to be painful. For example, we assume that technical assistance is welcomed in Asia. On the contrary the Indonesians do not want it on the terms that it is offered. A press made for Detroit is useless in Malaya. In Pakistan and India wells are infested and roads are worn down, yet there is a high unemployment rate among graduates of MIT.

In addition, the tensions between haves and have-nots are bitter and cause resentment of the US. In contrast Asians sympathize with Russia as a have-not nation.

Racial antipathy. Resentment against attitudes of white superiority is a natural and bitter feeling in Asia, perpetuated by the treatment of Indians and Moslems in Africa, and by continued prejudices of Westerners in Asia. It is not openly discussed. But every attack on the status of the Negro in America is fully reported throughout the press of Asia. Partly the emphasis on discrimination overseas represents a transfer of guilt. "Indignation at South Africa's policy of apartheid," as an article in the Indian magazine *Thought* declared, "has always been keener with us than any concern at the age-old and continuing practice of untouchability in our own midst."

Cultural antipathy. The traditional line drawn between the mysticism of Asia and the materialism of the West is misleading. "The East in its great beginnings in India and China," as the *Eastern Economist* argues, "was scientific and rational; the West taking its religions from the East, was mystical and religious even in the throes of the Renaissance." The US is an individualist rather than a materialist nation today, and the crying need of Asia is for a rise in material standards.

At the same time there are deepseated sources of cultural antipathy between Asia and the US. Nehru certainly feels that American culture is shallow, mechanistic and mass-produced. He distrusts a society in which the man of learning is held in such contempt, and the man of wealth can purchase political power with so much ease. He senses that Americans lack subtlety and the wisdom to handle the immense power thrust upon them.

The man of peace is still the great man of Asia. The way to peace is conciliation and deals made behind the scenes. Asians fear our apparent willingness to accept a Third World War. Above all they fear our methods of waging war. Survival has been the first objective of the individual in Asia. As long as the common man could shut himself in his house through wars and revolutions, it did not greatly matter which side in a succession of foreign and domestic tyrants oppressed him. The B29, blasting away the house itself, has given him a new sense of insecurity. The Communists, of course, have squeezed the last drop of political benefit from their mechanical inability to match the strategic air power of the West, and its atom bomb.

Beyond these antipathies are the misunderstandings concerning the West, and above all, the US. There is the quaint notion of the US hanging suspended in the 19th century, with Adam Smith in one hand and Herbert Spencer in the other, seeking to convert the world to laissez-faire capitalism. There is the ugly notion of the US as a country thirsting for war. There are three persistent illusions that lead Asians to believe that US aid can be taken for granted and public opinion in the West safely ignored.

The first illusion is sired by Marxism and teaches that since capitalist nations are bedevilled by falling profits, idle capacity and mass unemployment, they must export their capital to foreign nations gracious enough, or foolhardy enough, to accept it.

The second illusion is sired by Hollywood, and teaches that the US is a huge storehouse of unlimited wealth where at the twist of a spigot goods pour out in such profusion that the most miserly nation would not begrudge giving peoples overseas all that they need.

The third illusion is sired by our Government and our press. It teaches Asia that the US is gripped by such an unreasoning hysteria that if any nation conjures up an apparition of Communism we shall insist that it accept a blank check on our limitless account.

There are other illusions in Asia that create dangerous optimism and destructive fear, just as false complacency is created in America by Asian diplomats who draw a [illegible]nares veil across the crying needs of their peoples.

Beyond these misunderstandings are genuine conflicts of interest between Asia and the West. They have been significant. Efforts to organize Asian neutrality, to keep the UN as an organization to which neutrals can safely belong by restricting its anti-aggression role, and to play balance-of-power politics by backing Communism as the weaker side in the world struggle, have run counter to legitimate Western aims. Now as Soviet pressures bear down on Asia the values that we share become far more important than the conflicts and fears that divide us. Our deepest antagonisms must become superficial in comparison to the overriding determination of all independent peoples not to be crushed in the Soviet mill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *A Pardon for Dewey*

ANTICIPATING THAT, sooner or later, the proper New York official will remember his oath of office and proceed against Candidate Dewey for his promise of a state job during the recent campaign to Lieutenant Governor Hanley, it is suggested that Governor Dewey grant an anticipatory pardon to Candidate Dewey. It might make it possible for Governor Dewey to take the oath to enforce the laws again with a clearer conscience. It will be remembered that Dewey sought to persuade the voters of New York that Hanley voluntarily led the drive organized by certain financial interests of Wall Street to "draft" Dewey to run again for Governor, while he took the chance of running for Senator against Herbert Lehman.

I wonder whether Governor Dewey thinks that a man who has committed a crime against the public interest should be prosecuted regardless of his rank? Or is it his view that, while lesser personages should be rigorously prosecuted for violating a law, the Governor of New York is immune? If a man can violate the law with impunity, then it would seem that we are not a Government of laws but one of men. The immunity thus far enjoyed by Candidate Dewey from Governor Dewey so far as the Hanley letter is concerned would seem to indicate that the Government of New York State is a one-man Government.

When confronted during the campaign with his moral lapse, this man, who apparently thinks that laws are made for others but not for himself, was clearly caught off guard. His stammering and evasive "explanation" explained nothing, except that even the self-confident Governor of New York, on occasion, can stammer and be evasive.

I carefully read the New York papers at the time of this episode and on through election day. I have yet to see any, even a weak, denial on the part of any of Dewey's supporters that the Hanley letter exposing the Dewey bribe was not true. Even the great and undeserved victory won by Dewey did not serve to cover this stain upon the escutcheon of the titular national leader of his party.

But indefensible as was this offer of a price to Hanley to withdraw as a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor, it was an act of civic virtue as compared with the behavior of certain newspapers in New York City that in times past have fought for political decency.

Excepting only the New York *Post* and *Compass*, every newspaper published in greater New York attempted to gloss over what they would have stridently denounced as an offensive crime if committed by Dewey's opponent. They not only pooh-poohed this affront to public morality; by suggestion at least, they attempted to give it the appearance of a rare chastity. It was just "Great-Hearted Tom," the Eagle Scout, trying to allay the anxiety of "Poor Old Joe" as to his future security.

To be sure, "Great-Hearted Tom" was violating the law, although this was never admitted in so many words. He was improperly promising an appointment to a lucrative public office, but one cannot be too strict when warm-hearted generosities are displayed, even if momentarily, by a heart that can be cold and exacting when an errant straying of another is involved. Who would be so uncharitable as to begrudge "Poor Old Joe" the well-paid job that he has every right to expect after the induction of Governor Dewey for his next term? After all, the prospect of a well-padded state job was the consideration that made it possible for Governor Dewey conveniently to forget an earlier promise that he had given—this time to the people of his state—that, "for reasons of health," he would not be a candidate again for Governor.

But, according to Hanley's letter, every word of which rang true, other promises were made as an inducement to Hanley to play a touching, if somewhat dissembling, role in the make-believe "Draft of Dewey." According to his letter, Hanley was promised cash to pay his debts. This promise was to be carried out so that Hanley might reimburse his creditors "within 90 days." Surely the generous friends of Mr. Dewey who tossed this promise into the pot as a further inducement to Hanley to forget the ambition of a lifetime do not intend to keep "Poor Old Joe" on the anxious seat until the expiration of 90 days from the time that the promise was made. The debts, or at least some of them, have been publicly identified. They are past due. Undoubtedly the cash to pay them can be made available forthwith, thus resolving any worries that Hanley may still have as to his ability to pay his debts. Every one, including Governor Dewey, wants to be nice to "Poor Old Joe."

It is not impossible that Hanley may be uneasy about the state job that has been promised by the New York Governor. And well he may be, since Dewey's previous promise to support him for Governor to succeed himself turned out to be a broken reed upon which it was not possible to lean.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

A DOSSIER ON THE FBI: 1908 - 1950

by Alan Barth

IT SAYS a good deal about the current climate of opinion that one is tempted to praise Max Lowenthal's courage in writing a sober indictment of the FBI and to wonder at the hardihood of William Sloane Associates in publishing it. Anyone may disparage other agencies of the Government, the Department of State for example, and be hailed as a patriot for doing so. But the most significant fact about the FBI today is that disparagement of it is likely to be equated with disloyalty.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, by Max Lowenthal (William Sloane Associates; $4.50).

J. Edgar Hoover has long had the habit, as Mr. Lowenthal demonstrates, of answering criticism by impugning the character or motives of his critics. Thus, when a Detroit lawyer complained to the Senate Judiciary Committee about the treatment of his clients in the alien-deportation raids of 1920, Hoover promptly replied: "He is regarded as a Bolshevist leader. . . . His associates are persons who are active in radical circles." When the Bureau came under fire in 1940, its director told a radio audience that "Your FBI is respected by the good citizens of America as much as it is feared, hated and vilified by the scum of the underworld, conspiring Communists and goose-stepping bundsmen, their fellow travelers, mouthpieces and stooges. . . ." His rejoinder to recent complaints that the FBI had tapped telephone wires illegally in the Coplon case was: "Statements have been made which are so untrue and legally unsound that I am forced to conclude that they were motivated for the purpose of confusing the public. . . ." Shortly after his book was announced, Mr. Lowenthal himself had the honor of a subpoena from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The publishers call this book "an objective picture." It can be considered so only in the sense that the author refrains, until the final paragraph, from any editorial comment. It might more accurately be called a dossier. Mr. Lowenthal's method, like the method of the FBI itself, has been to assemble "unevaluated facts"—which is to say a great variety of data and opinions expressed by others—and to let them speak for themselves. They serve his purpose devastatingly. By selective reference to debates in Congress, Congressional hearings, official reports and contemporary newspapers, he has compiled a history of the Bureau from its illegitimate birth—it was created in 1908 by Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte after a requested authorization had been expressly rejected by the 60th Congress—down through the espionage and sedition trials of 1949-50. He quotes alternately the FBI's critics and its defenders, but this even-handedness is deceptive. Often the defense is more damning than the attack.

For all its effectiveness, Mr. Lowenthal's method has limitations. It hampers him in developing and clarifying some of the salient points in his indictment. The impact of his book may be somewhat diminished also because of its unrelieved condemnation of the Bureau. Credit to Hoover when credit is due might have given it a better balance. The director of the FBI has instilled a fine *esprit de corps* in his organization; he has kept it, apparently, free from venality—although some of his former agents have not been above profiting from their employment under him; he had the good sense to resist Congressional efforts to saddle him with the responsibility of passing on the loyalty of Government employees; his treatment of enemy aliens in World War II was discriminating and just; he had no part in, and indeed opposed, the Army's mass evacuation of Japanese Americans from the West Coast in 1942.

The most extensive and perhaps the most valuable portion of Mr. Lowenthal's book is its account of the alien-deportation raids of 1920. Aliens of all shades of opinion—and a number of citizens as well—were rounded up indiscriminately and treated with an extraordinary combination of stupidity and sadism. They were arrested in meeting halls—to which some of them had been led by undercover agents acting as *agents provocateurs;* they were routed out of bed in the early hours of the morning by officers who had no warrants to enter; they were held incommunicado; they were terrorized in many instances into signing confessions the meaning of which they did not understand. The evil genius behind this ugly episode in American history was Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer. But Mr. Lowenthal makes it plain that J. Edgar Hoover, then chief of the General Intelligence Division of the Bureau of Investigation, bore a heavy responsibility for the actual conduct of the raids—a responsibility he has repeatedly disclaimed in recent years.

The story of the 1920 hysteria is illuminating because it shows how readily overzealous officials can be led to ignore the laws, the procedures and the civil liberties they are entrusted to uphold. It is a disappointment that Mr. Lowenthal did not analyze current FBI activities with anything like the same thoroughness. The Bureau is different today, and so is the situation in which it operates.

The United States recovered its sanity and repented in the early 1920s—in large measure because members of the bar, many of them pillars of conservatism, spoke out in protest and acted to defend the traditions of their calling. The contemporary threats to freedom have evoked no comparable response.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At its recent convention in Washington, the American Bar Association adopted resolutions urging the President to sign the McCarran Act and advocating mandatory loyalty oaths for all lawyers. Mr. Lowenthal, himself a lawyer, has written a book which, as a challenge to authority, does honor to his profession.

The problem presented by the FBI stems not from the character or intentions of the agency and its director but from the activities it has been authorized to undertake by Congress and the President. When Harlan Stone became Attorney General in 1924, he reorganized the Bureau of Investigation, named Hoover its director and laid down this rule about its functions:

> The Bureau of Investigation is not concerned with political or other opinions of individuals. It is concerned only with their conduct, and then only with such conduct as is forbidden by the laws of the United States. When a police system passes beyond these limits, it is dangerous to the proper administration of justice and to human liberty, which it should be our first concern to cherish.

The Bureau had passed beyond these limits under Attorney General Palmer. It passed beyond them again in 1939 when President Roosevelt authorized it to investigate espionage, sabotage and subversive activities. It passed still farther beyond when it was instructed to investigate the loyalty of federal employees.

In the course of these activities, it compiled great numbers of secret dossiers on American citizens who were guilty of no criminal conduct. It resorted to methods such as wiretapping and the use of anonymous informers which did violence to settled American traditions and which had a profoundly inhibiting effect on many law-abiding persons. The anxiety now experienced by great numbers of loyal Americans—the fear that they are being spied upon or that their telephones are tapped or that the voluntary associations they join may be called subversive—has a stultifying effect, whether or not the anxiety is justified, on the operation of the democratic process. When men fear that they may be under surveillance because of opinions or associations which a police agency considers subversive, they cease to be free men.

What Mr. Lowenthal fails to make clear is that the danger to individual freedom arises from the power given to Mr. Hoover—not from any malevolence on his part. He is a man of unquestionable patriotic zeal. But in no area is the influence of power so corrupting as in the work of the police. Policemen can be kept useful to society only as they are kept rigorously under control. It is beside the point that Hoover has good intentions, that he does not mean to direct a secret police. A secret police is a police that operates in secret, that maintains secret dossiers, that uses secret agents. The FBI, at least in part, now answers this description.

Mr. Lowenthal's indictment is much too impressive to be dismissed. It ought to be brought to trial. Congress is now too torn politically to hear it in an atmosphere of reason. The appropriate tribunal would be an independent commission of universally respected private citizens. There is urgent need for such a commission to make an impartial study of internal security needs and of the relationship between national security and individual freedom.

Alan Barth, a member of the editorial staff of the Washington "Post," is the author of "The Loyalty of Free Men," to be published by Viking in January.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR TIMES

THE PROSPECT BEFORE US, by John Dos Passos (Houghton Mifflin; $3.75).

AN ACADEMIC REVIEWER approaches with some trepidation the work of a literary fellow. Mr. Dos Passos' publishers describe him as a "recorder of contemporary society without peer in all literary history." Without question, the "recorder" himself would regard such characterization as nothing more than a ritualistic observance of the conventions of the book trade. Yet such assertions arouse hopeful expectations in the mind of an academic fellow who is troubled by the same sort of questions that worry Mr. Dos Passos and who has a curiosity about how to get the answers. Perhaps, one is led to believe, here is a book with the answers.

The central problem of our times, as Dos Passos sees it, is the contrivance of means to control, in the interest of individual men, the corporations or bureaucracies that boss us. Whether the top management calls itself Capitalist or Socialist, the man who works at a bench or at a desk occupies about the same position in the hierarchy of administration. And even the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has its resemblances to the hierarchies of Capitalism. Whatever the political label, industrial society erects corporation, trade-union or governmental bureaucracies with enormous power over the individual.

In essence the book consists of a series of brief sketches of personalities, situations, events chosen to suggest the nature of the hierarchical world in which we live. The author casts himself in the role of a "lecturer" and equips himself with an audience, including a farmer, a manufacturer, a "labor skate," whose heckling compels a sharpening and elaboration of the "lectures." Part I, "The Preparation of a New Society," discusses Great Britain of the blitz and of the Labour Government: "Ordeal by Fire" and "Ordeal by Government." The upshot seems to be that one set of bosses has been substituted for another. Part II, "Principles of Power," contains glimpses of South America, an area teetering between dictatorship and government by consent. In Part III, "Dedicated to a Proposition," the "lecturer" returns home and reports on farms in Iowa and two corporate organizations: a milling company and the Rubber Workers International. And here he argues the proposition that increased participation is the solution.

The grand architecture of social systems is kept in the background; the focus is individual, episodic, personal. Barrow boys in Golden Square sell peaches on the move. Stopping, they would require a license to set up a stall: "It's a cyse of regulytions." The cooperative manager at Evesham is plagued by surpluses: "In London cauliflowers are a shilling and here we give them away." Dr. Penido is a Brazilian health officer in the Vale do Rio Noce, where "a privy was a monstrous novelty five

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years ago." An officer of the Argentine Railroad Workers: "Of course we are for Peron. Before Peron the labor movement in Argentina was at the mercy of the police." The Ohio labor spokesman on the grievance committee: "They've got all the money and brains on their side and all we've got is the union." The Rubber Workers' official on time study: "We'd rather have men out of the shop than hired experts, they have the thinking of the working people." The Buffalo grain-elevator superintendent with twenty-three years' service: "If you get into it when you're young you stick to it . . . it becomes part of your life."

It is doubtful that the sketches add up to much that we did not know before. Yet the book has great merit and interest as a piece of perceptive reporting—a sort of a sociological travelogue in first-rate English—on the anxieties, beliefs and hopes of real people scattered over the Western world. We have no means of knowing whether Dos Passos' random test borings give a valid general picture of the societies he inspects. His vague prescriptions are based on faith, a faith which this reviewer shares, yet nevertheless a faith: "We've got to invent new methods for the participation of more people in the apparatus of industrial society."

Dos Passos' uncertainties are his strength. Unhampered by ideological blinders or by dogma, he gropes to understand, and he believes a solution can be found, although its precise form cannot be discerned. "An entire science [of human behavior] lies ahead. In that science we may find the tools with which to build out of our runaway institutions a society which will be tolerably stable because it will offer participation to each individual man." And Dos Passos writes his own review: "About all a moderately observant man of letters with a certain amount of experience in a somewhat special sort of journalism can do to add his nickel's worth to these solutions is to set forth what he has seen and what in his opinion it means." V. O. KEY JR.

V. O. Key Jr., author of "Southern Politics," is a professor of Government at Yale University.

AN ENIGMATICAL GENIUS

SHOOTING AN ELEPHANT AND OTHER ESSAYS, by George Orwell (Harcourt, Brace; $2.75).

GEORGE ORWELL'S writing and character can be described by a somewhat overworked idea: he was extremely "Hamletish," not in the sense that he was a morbid brooder—he was never that—but in the deeper sense of being able to see both sides of many questions with equal and therefore puzzling sympathy. He was an essentially paradoxical man. He was a person who saw through prejudice, but was never rid of his own. He hated the use of un-thought-out political catch-phrases, and yet he could use words such as "Left" and "reactionary" as though they contained precise meaning. He ridiculed the pretensions and affectations of people who regarded themselves as advanced thinkers, "the Pansy-Left" as he sometimes called them, but he never lost an absurd conviction that everyone on the opposite political side was basically mad or wicked. I believe he would rather have been killed than have committed any action in the least treacherous to the rights and liberties of artists, but his understanding of pictures and poetry was negligible. This saintly man regarded sanctity as rubbish.

The present book has nine of his longer essays (not hitherto published in book form) and nine lighter pieces from his contributions to the English Labour weekly, *Tribune*. He was a philosophical writer whose descriptive essays contained almost as much of his thought as did his political work. The first two of these pieces—"Shooting an Elephant" and "A Hanging"—are examples of his formidable evocative power and also acute studies of the experience of guilt combined with authority. An essay on Tolstoy's hatred of Shakespeare, and another on *Gulliver's Travels*, are as good literary criticism as his great essays on Kipling and Dickens, essays which have had a decisive influence and rescued many from "Pansy-Left" narrowness; but I think it is a pity that the two essays, "Politics and the English Language" and "The Prevention of Literature," have been included. They contain much admirable sense, but they contain, too, some overstated views, and some prophecies as doubtful as those of James Burnham which he so rightly mocks in the last of the longer pieces.

All the same, I will make one prophecy myself. George Orwell will be read for a long time to come, but for a reason which might not have much pleased him —namely, that he is such splendid entertainment. His themes are usually distressing, but somehow his valiant treatment of them sends our spirits up. On the few occasions when I met him we talked of melancholy subjects—and he made my day. CHRISTOPHER SYKES

Christopher Sykes, the British novelist and critic, is the author of "Four Studies in Loyalty," "Answer to Question 33" and the recently published "Character and Situation."

DEATH IN THE FAMILY

THE TROUBLE OF ONE HOUSE, by Brendan Gill (Doubleday; $3).

IN *The Trouble of One House*, Mr. Gill has cast a clear and wise eye on the interplay of emotions, the sudden twists and wild proliferations of cause and effect in family relationships. The central force in this group is Elizabeth Rowan, a young mother of three children who is dying of cancer. She is a woman with a boundless capacity for loving, an effulgence of generosity and happiness which casts its glow on everyone around her.

A lesser writer would make of such love a balm for all wounds; Mr. Gill is too knowing to take a view so simple and false. Instead, we see Elizabeth's husband shrinking from its smothering warmth; her barren sister is driven by envy of it into a frenzy of nasty little plots to gain an ultimate triumph over Elizabeth, the control of her house and children. On the other hand, Miss Gately, the nurse attending the dying woman, is enough moved by Elizabeth's quality to start divesting herself of her own icy armor.

There are others in the novel—the children, the doctor in attendance, the priests—who all reflect Elizabeth's spirit and react variously to it. But Mr. Gill's matter does not stop there. The chain of inter-reactions goes on and on and the links are a series of brilliant scenes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sometimes shocking in their truth. One of the most memorable is that in which Dr. Rowan, worn by his wife's illness and death and jarred by the grotesquery of his children giggling uncontrollably as they view their dead mother, vents his misery and bewilderment on his little son.

Not a false note is struck in this mature and honest novel. Although the book is beautifully contrived, there is no creak of machinery. Each person, down to the wry, engaging little son, is vivid, complex and always understandably motivated, and the style is consistently quiet and subtle. KATE SIMON

Kate Simon has worked for the Book-of-the-Month Club and the Limited Editions Club. She is now a free-lance reviewer.

For want of space . . .

The editors offer these notes to describe briefly current books that may be of interest to their readers.

Challenge and Decision, by Edgar Ansel Mowrer. McGraw-Hill; $3.75.

The Pulitzer Prize foreign correspondent, political commentator and critic of recent American foreign policy offers his program for world peace under American leadership. A world federation, including the Russians or "containing" the Russians, is his proposal.

The Wrath of Achilles, by I. A. Richards. Norton; $2.50.

A "reader's" text of *The Iliad*, re-translated into colloquial English and cut "in the interest of action."

H. G. Wells, by Antonina Vallentin. John Day; $4.

The "Prophet of Our Day" in a popular biography that stresses Wells's gifts of foresight and the "lesson" he offers for the future.

The Idea and Practice of General Education. University of Chicago Press; $3.50.

An exhaustive description of the theory, curriculum and teaching methods that comprise the "Chicago idea." By past and present faculty members of the College of the University of Chicago.

The Purse and the Sword, by Elias Huzar. Cornell; $4.50.

A specialized history of the past 17 years in US Government affairs. By showing how Congress appropriates funds for the Military Establishment the author illuminates two touchy subjects: the relation between legislative bodies and administrative agencies and the relation between civil authority and military power.

Life's Picture History of World War II. Time, Inc., and Simon and Schuster; $10.

This full-dress "presentation" by the editors of *Life* is for anyone who wants, and can afford, the most comprehensive picture album of the war ever likely to be compiled. A few of the famous great pictures are omitted, presumably as hackneyed, but otherwise it is a well-selected, intelligently-organized job. John Dos Passos contributes introductions to the several theatres and phases of the war. It is vivid, if surface, history.

MUSIC: Bing Comes to Town

THE OPENING-NIGHT performance of the Metropolitan Opera's sixty-sixth season on November 6 aroused a public interest such as the old yellow-brick building at Broadway and Thirty-ninth Street had not witnessed in many years. No single seats were sold for the opening, but nearly 3,500 patrons bought tickets in a compulsory package deal that also included, at a $60 top, the subsequent first nights of "Die Fledermaus" and "Fidelio." It was not the opera—Verdi's stirring but relatively little-known "Don Carlo," revived after 28 years—that attracted so extensive a public. This was the first performance presented by Rudolf Bing, who took over as general manager when Edward Johnson retired last spring after 15 years of steadily diminishing artistic returns.

Bing had kept his promise to renovate the staging at the Metropolitan. When the curtain rose on the first scene, in the cloister of the Spanish monastery of St. Just, it was instantly apparent that a new era had begun. Soaring Gothic arches, planned to make use of the full dimensions of the stage rather than to fit in a baggage car on tour, dwarfed the human figures on the stage and symbolized the vast power of the Catholic Church and the Inquisition, with which the opera deals. The lighting, instead of pouring a fixed glare upon the upper reaches of the setting at the expense of the people on stage level, was expressively focused on the monk whose solo begins the piece. Most remarkable of all, the Metropolitan now has a spotlight capable of following key figures around the stage. With this production, it sloughed off 25 years of sterile tradition and proclaimed itself a modern theatre.

The felicitous settings for "Don Carlo" were designed by Rolf Gerard, a craftsman from the legitimate theatre whom Bing engaged because he admired his work for Katherine Cornell's production of "That Lady," a piece concerned, like "Don Carlo," with the triangular intrigue of Philip II, his son Don Carlos, and Elizabeth of Valois. Gerard also designed the rich costumes, deriving his values and color harmonies from El Greco. The visual ensemble was as tasteful and imaginative as the best to be seen on Broadway, but on a scale few Broadway productions have achieved since the demolition of the Hippodrome.

Bing had also persuaded Margaret Webster to stage and direct "Don Carlo." This was her first operatic direction, and she is said to have felt some uncertainty about her ability to live up to what was expected of her. Paradoxically, a kind of staging she has never undertaken before turns out to be the kind she can do best. In her Shakespeare productions she has often failed to get to the bottom of the motivation and relationships of the characters, and has tended to rest a large part of her case on her skill with pageantry. In an opera performance, the stage director's task consists precisely in making the pageant look as handsome and as reasonable as possible. Fine details of characterization—except in the case of a few extraordinary operatic actors—are more to be found in the nuances of the performers' singing than in their bodily movement. The operatic stage director has no control whatever over the way lines are delivered; this falls to the conductor and the composer. Consequently Miss Webster's defect as a Shakespeare director becomes her virtue as an operatic director, and I do not think any *régisseur* in the world could improve materially upon her clean, spacious, natural deployment of the people on the stage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Musically, too, the performance was shipshape. A fine conductor, Fritz Stiedry, and a fine cast presented the score with the sort of teamwork only extensive and careful rehearsal can bring about; the chorus, superbly trained by Kurt Adler, sang magnificently without engaging in its habitual gesticulations. Three foreign stars, having successfully cleared Ellis Island, made their debuts. Cesare Siepi, a 27-year-old Italian bass engaged for the role of Philip when the State Department refused a visa to Boris Christoff, proved to be an excellently disciplined artist whose best days lie ahead (he is already an admirable actor), when age has given him stronger authority and a darker, heavier vocal timbre. Fedora Barbieri, an Italian mezzo-soprano of similar age but considerably greater weight, impersonated the scheming Countess of Eboli in volatile fashion and sang effectively in a rough, provincial way. As Elizabeth, the Argentine soprano, Delia Rigal, maintained a queenly presence and sang with deeply affecting tragic inflection. Her voice was recalcitrant until the last act, but then it poured forth with a splendor that is rare today in the operatic world.

The incoming foreigners were joined in the cast by the first-line regulars, Jussi Bjoerling, Robert Merrill and Jerome Hines. If there were weaknesses here and there, notably in young Hines's inadequate realization of the blind, 90-year-old Grand Inquisitor, the performance was nevertheless one of quality, and certainly by far the best the Metropolitan has given in many seasons.

Bing followed "Don Carlo" immediately with a second new production, Wagner's "The Flying Dutchman," provided with settings executed by Charles Elson from sketches by Robert Edmond Jones. This production, while creditable, did not match "Don Carlo." Both Jones's imagination and Herbert Graf's ideas about stage direction petered out, and the last act bore an uncomfortable resemblance to what the Metropolitan has been doing all along. But the opening scene, with the misty seacoast and the eerie arrival of the Dutchman's phantom vessel, was a masterpiece of illusion. And in the title role the Austrian baritone Hans Hotter, making his North American debut, showed himself to be the most profound interpreter of Wagner, in both song and action, the Metropolitan has known since the retirement of Friedrich Schorr.

And so, in his first two productions, Bing has in large measure fulfilled his patrons' hopes. He now faces a further and grimmer test. To what extent will he be able to revivify the routine repertory — "La Traviata," "Faust," "La Bohème" and the like—for which, the budget being what it is, neither new productions nor extensive rehearsals are possible? CECIL SMITH

MOVIES: Holiday Build-up

ALMOST NO CRITIC, when speaking officially, has a good word to say of Edmond Rostand's "Cyrano de Bergerac." It is grossly improbable and emotionally absurd, a play for the groundlings that reeks of grease paint, stale dust and mice in the upholstery. But just because of that sharp, exciting aroma, no one with a love for the theatre can resist a capable performance of "Cyrano"; it is the most completely theatrical play in the standard repertory, and addicts return year after year to gorge themselves on its staginess.

You would expect, then, that a screen version of this gasconade would suffer in the translation to another medium, and the current Stanley Kramer production, dragged from its native element, gasps a bit for life. Nevertheless, José Ferrer, this generation's Cyrano, turns in a bravura, gas-lit performance, and it is just possible to imagine yourself into the right environment. How this "faithful" picture will appeal to an audience raised on movies and with no theatre memories to fall back on, I cannot say; such observers may find it tame and miss the excitements of Tyrone Power and Orson Welles.

As inevitably happens in a production of Rostand's drama, Ferrer is a one-man show. But even so, he could have been given more able support, particularly by Mala Powers, the Roxane of this revival. No one would call Rostand's heroine a rewarding part, for it is compounded of treacle and silliness, but the actress assigned to the role can throw herself into it at least to the extent of heaving her bosom during the balcony scene. Miss Power undergoes that emotional cloudburst as though she were standing patiently while the dressmaker completed a fitting.

It may be frivolous to say so, but I thought that Ferrer's nose was too large. As I observed a couple of weeks ago, the screen is a more intimate, though less immediate, medium than the stage, and details are easily overstated. Cyrano's nose was certainly a misfortune, but only he suggested that it was a promontory, and the proboscis that Ferrer wears is so alarmingly unstable that it distracts attention from Cyrano's personality and dwarfs the humanity that he must at times convey. I would have had it about five centimeters shorter. On the other hand, I would not spare a foot of the sword play; it is virtuoso fencing, deft, witty and seemingly dangerous.

J. B. Priestley, the cosmosentimentalist, is one of the great puppeteers of our times. A man of unfailing compassion and sufficient ego, he puts his beloved Lilliputians through one transcendental experience after another for the good of their souls and the satisfaction of his sense of what is fitting. He pulls the strings with such jolly good fellowship, to say nothing of ingenuity and skill, that only a churl will complain that human beings don't really behave so neatly. Priestley's stories always spin well and they dispense a feeling of convivial love for humanity, like a warm drink on a damp day.

Thus it is with "Last Holiday," a new British import starring Alec Guinness and written by Mr. Priestley. George Bird, salesman of farm implements, is under sentence of death by his doctor; thus relieved of temporal worries and worldly scruples, he is able to work con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siderable good among the residents of an exclusive and preposterous resort hotel. You will guess at once that Mr. Bird is not really a dying man, but Priestley knew you would and slyly outguesses you.

Guinness plays the part of a diffident man, growing in authority as he burns his inhibitions behind him, with ingratiating and modest humor. He is an actor who studies to make the "business" of acting amusing in itself, and this is fun to watch, particularly in farce, if you don't have to see it too often. As usual in British pictures, the incidental characterizations are cleverly worked out, attractive portraits being contributed by Beatrice Campbell, Kay Walsh, Muriel George, Sidney James and one or two others whose names mean nothing in this country. "Last Holiday" is full of "yes, but's" that may come back later to annoy you, but they won't spoil your pleasure while the yarn is unreeling.

The two new French pictures might get by all right in a neighborhood theatre in Paris, but you expect something more of films that have been carted all the way across the ocean.

"L'Affaire," starring Claude Dauphin and Anne Vernon, may be taken as a terrible warning to busy husbands. It concerns a seduction that comes so close to succeeding as makes only a technical difference and it is played out with the suave sensuality that is called "Continental" by people who live elsewhere. The principal actors are adept at that game: M. Dauphin, cast as a *ravissant* pianist, is an authentic boulevard specimen, and Mlle. Vernon, beautiful herself and beautifully turned out for the play, makes this travesty of a farce worth looking at in snatches. But the story is too thin to support even this couple's graceful frivolities.

Julien Duvivier's "The Sinners" is scarcely trivial but it is a surprisingly confused picture to have been written and directed by so estimable a craftsman. The action takes place in a girl's reformatory, the inmates of which are shockingly young for their prevailing offense. They are a racy crowd, good-humored in their shamelessness.

Into this feminine jungle comes a new sinner (Monique Melinand), charged with the French equivalent of vagrancy but fortified by the "pure" love of her boy friend (Serge Reggiani). The rest of the picture, involving riots, frightful mistreatment with overtones of perversion, a savage dog and a cloudburst, is taken up with the efforts of the girls to reunite their heroine with her Abélard.

The film is an uneasy combination of social documentary, Dickensian caricature and Cocteau romance. The emotional flavor (and some of the scenes) recall "Maedchen in Uniform," and members of the supporting cast, billed tastelessly as "ten future stars of the French screen," are shaped by Duvivier into appealing and interesting individuals. But the picture lacks the consistency that would have made the fate of its principals convincing or meaningful.

Forgetting Rider Haggard's story, forgetting the foolish behavior of the white actors in the movie, "King Solomon's Mines" is a superb "location" picture of Africa. It is the best African Technicolor I have seen and it was made by men who may very well have studied such documentaries as the Denis-Roosevelt "Dark Rapture" and the later Armand Denis "Savage Splendor." At any rate, they had the wit to let Africa tell its own story. Not entirely unprompted, however: the parade of fearsome, exotic and loathsome beasts is too eventful even for the jungle and the plains, and the native villages have been glorified a little. But the scenery is magnificent, the natives are real, beautiful and, in the case of the Watusis, tremendously impressive. These narrow-headed, aristocratic giants may well be the most regal and graceful of living peoples; they inspire speculation as to the lost Egyptian civilization whose kings and heroes they so much resemble.

Stewart Granger and Deborah Kerr, as Allan Quatermain and Elizabeth Curtis, play their parts with such shreds of dignity as the script permits them. I was grateful to them, and to the M-G-M technical staff, for letting me see so much of Africa again. ROBERT HATCH

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 H ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

ASSIGNMENTS

COLUMBIA, M.A., will accept free-lance assignments, writing, editing, research, proof-reading, publicity. Experienced. Telephone: OR-3-6126.

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

CHRISTMAS GREENS

FRESH AND DIFFERENT. Lovely Carolina long leaf pine sprays. Native cedar and pine sprays. Rare cone sprays and holly . . . Only $2.99 DELIVERED. Guy Causey's Little Farm, R#4, Greensboro, N. C.

CONSULTATION SERVICES

PROBLEMS? Consult a certified psychologist. Box 26, Times Square Station, N. Y.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $5.00.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 86S, Radio City, New York.

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. Alin, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.

LITERARY SERVICE

WRITERS! Book mss. wanted for publication, fiction, non-fiction. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

MAPLE SUGAR

CHRISTMAS Treats from Vermont. Pure Maple Sugar bricks; pound, $1.25 Maple Nut Fudge, pure maple syrup, cream, black walnuts, half-pound box $1.00. Attractively gift-wrapped, prices postpaid. **SUNWIND FARM,** Jamaica, Vt.

PERIODICAL

INTRO—a new quarterly magazine of literature and art presenting the new writers and artists of today. Order year's subscription $2.00—single copy 50¢. **INTRO,** Box 860, Grand Central Station, N. Y. C.

PECANS

WE ARE NOW HARVESTING jumbo, delicious, thin-shelled PECANS; ideal for gifts. Will ship prepaid (Cont. U.S.) 5 lbs. $3.25, 10 lbs. $5.50, 100 lbs. or more, F.O.B. 42¢ per lb. **FABIS FARM,** Brownwood, Texas.

POSITION WANTED

WOMAN, resigned from New York City public school system desires interesting work, part or full time with liberal organization. Box 12, The New Republic.

Classified Rates

Per word, once 12¢
Per word 6 times 11¢
Per word 13 times 10¢

NEW REPUBLIC

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OPINIONS DIFFER . . .

. . . about almost everything these days—about ballets and ballots, fiction and fission, prima donnas and presidents. We at the *New Republic* regard this as a healthy state of affairs. We've always dared to differ—violently at times—and to fight with courage and conviction for liberal ideas and ideals, even in the face of hostile reaction and inaction.

If you believe in this sort of honest, hard-hitting journalism, why not share the "New Republic" with your friends this Christmas.

- *A gift subscription to NR* is a regular reminder of your thoughtfulness . . . gives your friends the same satisfaction and enlightenment that you get from your weekly reading of the *New Republic.*
- *A gift subscription to NR* is easy on your gift budget—thanks to special, money-saving Christmas rates.

OPINIONS THAT *DON'T* DIFFER . . .

"As the events of the year became more complex, your gift copies of New Republic became more important to us. So I'm writing again to thank you for a Christmas gift that has helped us to think our way through a difficult year..." Mrs. M.B.D., Los Angeles, Calif.

"Having the New Republic has made me feel that I'm part of the Washington scene, and has given me a real understanding of national and world events..." Mr. M.L.F., Chicago, Illinois

"Thank you most heartily for sharing with me your New Republic. Now I begin to understand the way you feel about it..." Mrs. H.E.G., New York

CHRISTMAS ORDER FORM

New Republic • 40 East 49th Street • New York 17, N.Y.

Name .....
Address .....
City..... Zone.... State.....
☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal
☐ 1 Year ☐ 6 Months
Gift card to read from .....

Name .....
Address .....
City..... Zone.... State.....
☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal
☐ 1 Year ☐ 6 Months
Gift card to read from .....

Name .....
Address .....
City..... Zone.... State.....
☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal
☐ 1 Year ☐ 6 Months
Gift card to read from .....

Donor's Name .....
Address .....
City..... Zone.... State.....
Please include my own subscription as checked below:
☐ New Subscription ☐ Renewal
☐ 1 Year ☐ 6 Months
I enclose $..... ☐ Bill me later

Special Christmas Gift Rates

One 1 Yr. Subscription	$ 6.50
Two 1 Year Subscriptions	11.00
Each Additional 1 Yr. Subscription	5.50
One 6 Mos. Subscription	$ 3.25
Two 6 Mos. Subscriptions	5.50
Each Additional 6 Mos. Subscription	2.75

Your own subscription (new or extension) may be included at these special rates. For Canadian and foreign subscriptions, add $1 per year.

12-4-50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED